

Amendments to the Drawings:

Applicant proposes to amend Figures 4, 5A and 5B as indicated in the marked-up drawing figures 4, 5A and 5B submitted with this Amendment and Reply. In particular, Figure 4 has been amended to include a “95” label for the bus. Figure 5 has been amended to be relabeled as Figure 5A and Figure 5B, and to include an ST18 box and an ST17 box in that figure, as well as to include a “Y” and a “N” path for the outputs of box ST6.

Upon approval of these drawing changes, replacement formal drawing sheets for Figure 4, 5A and 5B will be submitted.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-10 are currently cancelled.

No claims are currently being amended.

Claims 11-19 are currently being added. Support for these new claims may be found on page 21, line 11 to page 23, line 27 of the specification, and in Figures 5A and 5B.

This amendment adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 11-19 are now pending in this application.

Objection to the Drawings:

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for the reasons set forth on pages 2-4 of the Office Action. With respect to the objection concerning reference signs mentioned in the specification but not in the drawings, Figure 4 has been amended to include a “95” label and Figure 5A has been amended to include a “ST7” box and label.

With respect to the objection concerning reference characters shown in the drawings but not mentioned in the specification, the specification has been amended to include a reference to label 77 in Figure 2 of the drawings. However, with respect to “Reference #128” in Figure 1 of the drawings, Applicant could not find such a reference number in that figure, and clarification is respectfully requested. Perhaps the Office Action meant to refer to “#28” instead of “#128”, but “#28” is mentioned on page 9, line 10 of the specification.

With respect to the objection of Figure 5 because it fails “to show in the flow chart of Fig 5 what happens when the main control section determines that printing can be performed with sufficient image quality shown in step 6 as described in the specification”, Figure 5A has been amended to include a box ST18 to note that the print image is printed in a normal manner in that instance. Please note that no new matter has been added, since this feature is

clear from the specification, in that a standard printing process is performed in the event the printing can be performed with sufficient image quality (as determined in step ST6).

Accordingly, all of the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Objection to the Title:

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive of the claimed invention. By way of this amendment and reply, the title as suggested on page 4 of the Office Action has been adopted.

Objection to the Specification:

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because certain features recited in claim 7 were allegedly not disclosed in the specification. Due to the cancellation of claim 7, this objection is now moot. The newly submitted claims are all believed to be fully supported by the specification and the drawings.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,792,153 to Tsujii in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,917,707 to Kubota, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,156 to Aritomi, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0057918A1 to Kojima et al.; claims 3, 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tsujii Kubota, Aritomi and Kojima as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,544 to Kanno et al.; and claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tsujii Kubota, Aritomi and Kojima as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,515 to Fall et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

In the present invention according to presently pending independent claims 11, 14 and 17, pre-scanning is performed at the time of copying and whether or not a sufficient image quality can be obtained with a compression rate set in advance by an operator is determined. Then, if necessary, a warning message is displayed in order for an operator to select continuing copying or copying with a decreased compression rate. Therefore, an image quality which satisfies the operator's needs can be provided.

The present invention can precisely reflect a user's demand by outputting a warning so as to change setting of a compression method and a compression rate when sufficient image quality cannot be obtained with a currently set compression rate in color copying.

None of the cited art of record teaches or suggests the following features of the present invention according to independent claims 11, 14 and 17. When an apparatus according to the present invention determines that sufficient image quality cannot be obtained during a copying process, it interrupts the copying process and displays a warning message in order for an operator to select continuing copying with a high compression rate or not.

Therefore, presently pending claims 11, 14 and 17 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Presently pending dependent claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are patentable due to their dependencies on either base claim 11, 14 or 17, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 20, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819